Second Supplement to Memorandum 69-43

Subject: New Topics

The attached letter from Ralph Kleps, Director of the Judicial Council of California, suggests a topic which the staff believes would be an excellent one for Commission study. However, the topic is one that would involve considerable controversy among the various groups that have been able to obtain priorities to the calendaring of particular cases over a period of many years. Probably the net effect of the study would be a recommendation that many of the existing priorities (and I have no idea of how many there are) should be eliminated or that some priorities should be assigned with the various matters that are now required to be given priority over all other matters.

Respectfully submitted,

John H. DeMoully Executive Secretary RALPH NUKLEPS

RICHARD A. FRANK DEPUTY DISSETOR

DIRECTOR

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

4200 STATE BUILDING, SAN FRANCISCO 94102

217 W. First St., Scient 1901, Los Angeles 99612 169 Library and Courts Bidg., Speramonte, 95814

April 23, 1969

Mr. John H. DeMoully Executive Secretary California Law Revision Commission School of Law Stanford University Stanford, California 94305

Dear John:

Some time ago you suggested that the Law Revision Commission might be interested in adding topics to their calendar that are relatively narrow in scope. One situation that has troubled us for some time is the condition of the statutory law that assigns priority to the calendaring of particular cases. There are a number of such statutory provisions and most of them were enacted by people interested only in a single problem of the moment which was taken care of by a particular statute. If the Law Revision Commission thought this area worth inquiring, it seems to me that it might be an appropriate topic for your consideration.

Please take this up with the Chairman of the Commission and let me know what you think.

Best regards,

Ralph N. Kleps

Director

RNK: jp